

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AMARILLO DIVISION

COREY BROCKMAN,  
TDCJ-CID No. 2282427,

Plaintiff,

v.

WILLIAM JONES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

2:24-CV-00036-Z-BR

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION**  
**TO DISMISS COMPLAINT**

On February 23, 2024, Plaintiff Corey Brockman, acting *pro se* and while a prisoner incarcerated in the Clements Unit of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, filed suit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF 3).

On March 15, 2024, the Court issued a Briefing Order requiring Brockman to fill out and return the provided questionnaire by April 15, 2024. (ECF 6). Brockman has not complied with the order, nor has he communicated with the Court in any way regarding his case.

The Court has given Brockman ample opportunity to comply with its order, yet he has failed to do so. Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. *Larson v. Scott*, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5th Cir. 1988); *see* FED. R. CIV. P. 41. “This authority [under Rule 41(b)] flows from the court’s inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases.” *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S. Ct. 1386 (1962)).

A *pro se* litigant is not exempt from compliance with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law. *Birl v. Estelle*, 660 F.2d 592, 593 (5th Cir. 1981); *Edwards v. Harris County*

*Sheriff's Office*, 864 F. Supp. 633, 637 (S.D. Tex. 1994). A *pro se* litigant who fails to comply with procedural rules has the burden of establishing excusable neglect, which is a strict standard requiring proof of more than mere ignorance. *Kersh v. Derozier*, 851 F.2d 1509, 1512 (5th Cir.1988); *Birl*, 660 F.2d at 593.

Brockman's failure to comply with this Court's order warrants dismissal for failure on his part to diligently prosecute this case.

#### RECOMMENDATION

It is the RECOMMENDATION of the United States Magistrate Judge that the Complaint filed by Corey Brockman (ECF 3) be DISMISSED without prejudice.

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE

The United States District Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation to each party by the most efficient means available.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

ENTERED May 21, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LEE ANN RENO  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

#### **\* NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT \***

Any party may object to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. In the event parties wish to object, they are hereby NOTIFIED that the deadline for filing objections is fourteen (14) days from the date of filing as indicated by the "entered" date directly above the signature line. Service is complete upon mailing, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), or transmission by electronic means, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(E). Any objections must be filed on or before the fourteenth (14th) day after this recommendation is filed as indicated by the "entered" date. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d).

Any such objections shall be made in a written pleading entitled “Objections to the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation.” Objecting parties shall file the written objections with the United States District Clerk and serve a copy of such objections on all other parties. A party’s failure to timely file written objections shall bar an aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings, legal conclusions, and recommendation set forth by the Magistrate Judge and accepted by the district court. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded by statute on other grounds*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), *as recognized in ACS Recovery Servs., Inc. v. Griffin*, 676 F.3d 512, 521 n.5 (5th Cir. 2012); *Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276–77 (5th Cir. 1988).